REMARKS

Claims 1-33, 35, and 36 were pending when last examined, all of which stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 10, 12-15, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 29, 31, 32, 35, and 36 are amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-33, 35, and 36 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,219,694 to Lazaridis et al. ("Lazaridis").

Claim 1 is patentable over Lazaridis because it recites "... a mobile unit ... for automatically generating a report ...." As stated on page 9 of the Response to Office Action filed on June 27, 2007, Lazaridis' mobile unit does not generate any report ***automatically***. Lazaridis describes a redirection program that allows messages received by a host system ("a user interface unit" in Claim 1) to automatically get redirected to a mobile device so the user does not have to be at the host system to receive the message. Thus, if any unit in Lazaridis' system generates automatic reports, it would be the host system, not the mobile unit. Page 8 of the Office Action mailed on September 24, 2007 ("the latest Office Action") states that "Push pages ... are known to be automated. In addition, col. 2, lines 14-17 of the Lazaridis reference states that the system is automated." Even assuming, *arguendo*, that this statement were true, the automated portion of Lazaridis' system would be the redirection ***from*** the host system to the mobile device, not a transmission from the mobile device to the host system. Thus, the fact that the mobile device of Claim 1 automatically generates a report distinguishes the invention from Lazaridis. When a message is transmitted from the mobile device to the host system in Lazaridis' system, a user sends the message (Lazarids, col. 9, lines 2-9) – i.e., the generation and transmission are not automatic.

Furthermore, Claim 1 is pantetable over Lazaridis for the additional reason that it recites "... a mobile unit ... for automatically generating a report according to the command ..." wherein the command is generated by a user interface unit. In the invention, the user interface unit controls mobile unit, for example by telling the mobile unit what information to include in the automatic report. This is distinguishable from Lazaridis' system, where the mobile unit provides a way for a user to remotely control the host system, for example by sending commands to it (see Lazaridis, col. 7, line 66 – col. 8, line 2; col. 13, lines 20-23).

Claims 2-14 depend from Claim 1 and are thus patentable over Lazaridis for the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claim 4, in particular, is distinguishable from Lazaridis for the additional reason that it recites "a means for determining a position of the mobile unit." FIG. 3 of the subject Application and its description, for example, shows that a GPS receiver 48 may be included in the mobile unit to determine its position (Application, page 8, lines 13-16). In contrast, there is no mention of determining the position of Lazaridis' mobile device 24. Although the latest Office Action cites to Lazaridis' Col. 8, lines 52-55 as teaching the element of Claim 4, this cited section in fact discusses repackaging and removing the outer envelope in a message and does not address determining the position of the mobile device 24. Lazaridis fails to teach or suggest determining the position of the mobile unit, and Claim 4 is thus patentable over Lazaridis.

Claim 15 is patentable over Lazaridis because it recites "a detection component for measuring a physical parameter ...." As described, for example on Application's page 5, lines 19-25, a "detection component" may measure speed, air bag status, door status, ambient temperature, etc. and includes probes, sensors, thermometers, etc. Although the latest Office Action cites to Lazaridis' col. 2, lines 61-65 as teaching "a detection component," there is no mention of a detection component or measurement of a physical parameter in this cited section. The only detection described in this section is of triggering events such as a screen-saver subsystem or a keyboard subsystem, and these do not concern physical parameters such as mobile unit speed, air bag status, door status, etc. Hence, Lazaridis fails to teach all the elements of Claim 15 and Claim 15 is patentable.

Claim 15 is patentable over Lazaridis for the additional reason that it recites that "the processor is for generating a report incorporating the physical parameter ...." As explained above in reference to Claim 1, Lazaridis' mobile device generates commands, not a report. Furthermore, since Lazaridis' mobile device does not measure a physical parameter, it cannot generate a report that incorporates a physical parameter.

Claims 16-19 depend from Claim 15 and are thus patentable over Lazaridis for the same reasons as Claim 15.

Claims 17 and 18, in particular, are distinguishable from Lazaridis because they recite "a receiver for receiving positioning information ... to determine a location of the mobile unit." As

explained above in reference to Claim 4, Lazaridis fails to teach or suggest any means of determining the location of its mobile unit 24.

Claim 20 is patentable over Lazaridis because it recites "automatically preparing a report incorporating the data ...." As explained above in reference to Claim 1, Lazaridis' system does not prepare any report automatically. The mobile device 24 of Lazaridis' system sends commands to the host system 10, and the host system 10 prepares a message it received for transmission to the mobile device 24 by compressing or encrypting the message (col. 7, lines 53-56). Although the host system 10 may automatically redirect messages to the mobile device, it does not automatically prepare a report according to a command. There is no automatic preparation of a report by the mobile device 24 disclosed anywhere in Lazaridis.

Claims 21-33 depend from Claim 20 and are therefore patentable over Lazaridis for the same reason as Claim 20.

Claim 34 is canceled.

Claim 35 is patentable over Lazaridis because it recites "means for obtaining physical data and positioning data...." As explained above in reference to Claim 15, Lazaridis fails to teach or suggest any means for obtaining physical data such as speed, air bag status, door status, etc. Furthermore, as explained above in reference to Claim 4, Lazaridis fails to teach or suggest any means for obtaining positioning data.

Claim 36 is patentable over Lazaridis because it recites "computer-readable instructions for obtaining physical data and positioning data" and "computer-readable instructions for preparing a report ...." The explanations provided in reference to Claim 35 apply to Claim 36.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, Claims 1-33, 35, and 36 are now in condition for allowance. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2257. Please telephone the undersigned attorney at (408) 392-9250 if there are any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP

Dated: January 22, 2008

By _____
Kieun "Jenny" Sung
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 48,639

MACPHERSON KWOK CHEN & HEID LLP
2033 Gateway Place, Ste. 400
San Jose, CA 95110
Telephone: (408) 392-9250
Facsimile: (408) 392-9262